IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Rashad Saleem Muhammad,) C/A No.: 2:14-4911-DCN-SVH
Plaintiff,	
vs.)))
City of North Charleston; North))
Charleston Police Department; Officer)
Delmar Johnson; Officer Gregory (Greg))
Gomes; Officer Angela Hudson; Officer	
Matthew (Matt) Hughes; Officer Kim)
(Theresa) Spears; Officer William) REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
(Willy) Jackson; Officer Angela Bunker;)
South Carolina Law Enforcement	
Division; Forensic Scientist Catherine	
Leisy; United States of America;	
Immigration and Customs Enforcement;	
Agent Christopher Neville; Agent Brian	
Robinson; Agent Jeffrey Myrick; United	
States Attorney's Office; Assistant	
United States Attorney Matthew J.	
Modica, and others,)
Defendants.)))

Rashad Saleem Muhammad ("Plaintiff"), proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the court are motions to dismiss filed on September 21, 2015, by Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Matthew J Modica ("Modica"), Jeffrey Myrick, Christopher Neville, Brian Robinson, United States of America, United States Attorneys' Office [ECF No. 34] and by Modica individually [ECF No. 35]. All pretrial proceedings in this case were referred to the undersigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.). Because they are dispositive motions, this report and

recommendation is entered for review by the district judge.

As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order pursuant to *Roseboro v*. *Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), on September 22, 2015, advising him of the importance of the motions to dismiss and of the need for him to file adequate responses. [ECF No. 36]. On October 7, 2015, the *Roseboro* order was returned to the Clerk of Court's office via the United States Postal Service as "undeliverable" and "unable to forward." [ECF No. 39]. On October 9, 2015, counsel for Modica filed a notice of returned mail [ECF No. 40], indicating his notice of appearance had been returned as undeliverable. Plaintiff was previously directed by order of this court to keep the court apprised of any change in address:

You are ordered to always keep the Clerk of Court advised in writing (901 Richland Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201) if your address changes for any reason, so as to assure that orders or other matters that specify deadlines for you to meet will be received by you. If as a result of your failure to comply with this order, you fail to meet a deadline set by this court, your case may be dismissed for violating this order. Therefore, if you have a change of address before this case is ended, you must comply with this order by immediately advising the Clerk of Court in writing of such change of address and providing the court with the docket number of all pending cases you have filed with this court. Your failure to do so will not be excused by the court.

[ECF No. 7; see also ECF No. 10] (emphasis in original). Plaintiff has not notified the court of any change of address. Plaintiff has failed to comply with the court's order, and as a result, neither the court nor defendants have any means of contacting him concerning his case.

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that this action be dismissed with prejudice, in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). The Clerk is directed to send this

2:14-cv-04911-DCN Date Filed 10/13/15 Entry Number 41 Page 3 of 4

Report and Recommendation to Plaintiff at his last known address. If Plaintiff notifies

the court within the time set for filing objections to this Report and Recommendation that

he wishes to continue with this case and provides a current address, the Clerk is directed to

vacate this Report and Recommendation and return this file to the undersigned for further

handling. If, however, no objections are filed, the Clerk shall forward this Report and

Recommendation to the district judge for disposition.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

October 13, 2015

Columbia, South Carolina

Shiva V. Hodges

Shira V. Hodges

United States Magistrate Judge

The parties are directed to note the important information in the attached "Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation."

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. "[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Robin L. Blume, Clerk
United States District Court
901 Richland Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).